ED 021 814 24 SP 001 587

By: Miller, Elbert L.

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION TECHNIQUES;PREPARING DESIGNATED PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL TO EVALUATE PRESENT AND FUTURE TITLE I PROJECTS (JUNE 20-AUGUST 12, 1966).

Ball State Univ., Muncie, Ind.
Spons Agency: Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, DC. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No: BR-6-1799
Pub Date: 22 Aug 66
Grant: OEC-3-6-061799-0598
Note: 18p.
EDRS Price MF: $0.25 HC: $0.80
Descriptors: COURSES, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, *EVALUATION TECHNIQUES, FIELD TRIPS, FILMS, *INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), *RESEARCH METHODOLOGY, *SCHOOL PERSONNEL.
Identifiers: Ball State University, *Elementary And Secondary Education Act, ESEA Title I, Title III

An 8-week summer institute was conducted to train 27 public school persons to better evaluate Title I, Title III, and other curriculum-improvement programs. Focus was on improving the planning, measurement, and educational research competencies of the participants. A "core curriculum" of 12 quarter hours for graduate credit was supplemented by reading experiences, individual and small group projects, speakers and consultants, films and field trips. Because of background deficiencies of the participants, a course in statistics was added, and the research practicum was modified to include more teaching of research design and methodology than planned. The result was a lower level of research competency at the end of the institute than had originally been hoped for, but evaluations of pre- and posttesting, questionnaires, and semantic-differential-type attitude instruments indicated that substantial progress had been made toward achieving the original objectives. The need to continue such programs and to provide follow-up became clear. Outstanding aspects of the program, according to trainees, were the statistics course; the approach to curriculum planning, change, and evaluation, particularly as it related to educationally and culturally disadvantaged children; the reading and discussion procedure; and individual and group projects. (JS)

BR-6-1799
PH 24

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT
Grant No. OEG-3-6-061799-0598

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION TECHNIQUES: PREPARING DESIGNATED PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL TO EVALUATE PRESENT AND *FUTURE TITLE I PROJECTS*

August 22, 1966

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

SP001587
ED021814

Research and Evaluation Techniques: Preparing Designated Public School Personnel to Evaluate Present and Future Title I Projects

Grant No. OEG-3-6-061799-0598

Dr. Ebert L. Miller, Program Director

June 20 - August 12, 1966

The training program reported herein was conducted pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Grantees undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement of the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Ball State University

Muncie, Indiana

Orientation of Program

The program was an eight-week summer institute (dates June 20 through August 12, 1966) for the purpose of training twenty seven public school persons to better evaluate Title I, Title III, and other curriculum improvement programs.

The primary objective of the program was to improve the planning, measurement, and educational research competencies of the participants. More explicitly, the curricular objectives were as follows:

a. To prepare the participants to read and interpret research (from basic research to applied research) findings in behavioral sciences which have implications for educational practice.

b. To prepare the participants to plann and evaluate educational programs in relation to the special needs of "educationally deprived children in low-income areas."

c. To prepare the participants to make use of special data handling resources. Including information about the availability of computer facilities and research centers as weel as basic information about research design and data collection so that the research resources may be more effectively utilized.

d. To prepare the participants to conduct educational research and evaluation projects within a public school setting. To accomplish this the following topical areas constitute the basis:
   (1) The nature of educational research (e.g., objectives, criteria for good research, errors of research, strenghts and weaknesses of varioys research approaches).
   (2) research techniques (e.g., the library, statistical considerations, sampling, interviewing, observing, recording, reporting).
   (3) research methods and design.
   (4) the evaluation of existing measurement devices in education.
   (5) the construction of measuring instruments to fit sepcific Title I, Title III, and other curriculum improvement programs.
   (6) The adaptation of standardized instruments to the needs of educationally disadvantaged pupils.
   (7) methods of determining local and/or technical validity and reliability of measurement procedures.
   (8) data collection.
   (9) analysis of data.
   (10) reporting results and dissemination activities.

In order to achieve the curricular objectives and at the same time maximize the chances of such knowledge and skills becoming functional, attention was given to how the institute was carried out. The following procedural objectives centered on "how"

the institute was conducted:

a. to maintain a favorable balance between group learning situations and individualized help.
b. to achieve an atmosphere of mature, experienced, professional people who have common needs in relation to educational research knowledge and skills.
c. to capitalize on the motivational aspects of the need for and usefulness of research competencies in relation to the participants' designated responsibility for directing the planning and evaluation of Title I, Title III (the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965- P.L. 89-10) and other curricular programs.

Description of the Program

In an effort to achieve the curricular objectives of the program a "core curriculum" for which twelve quarter hours of graduate credit could be received was used. Reading experiences, individual and small group projects, speakers and consults, films, and field trips were related to the core experiences. The difference in credit hours from nine to twelve (noted by comparing the proposal with this report) is a result of a necessary change in the curricular content of the core. Applications and inquiries from potential applicants made clear to the staff the fact that most public school persons in Indiana and Illinois who were currently responsible for planning curriculum change projects had not taken a basic statistics course as part of their preparation (all had completed at least a masters degree). As a result a basic course in statistics was included and the research practicum course was modified to include more teaching of research design and methodology than had been originally planned. These changes resulted in a relatively lower level of research competency at the end of the institute than the staff had originally hoped for and had inferred in their statement of objectives. An additional result was a greater emphasis upon class work and large group projects than initially planned for. The coordination of research methodology and statistics methods throughout the entire period of the institute was very difficult to achieve because of the rather large difference in participant sophistication in these areas. This was probably the most frustrating aspect of the institute for both the staff and the participants. Each part was important but timing often prevented a clear picture of how the parts relate to each other.

Credit for Ball State University Courses was given as follows:

a. Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research - 4 quarter hours of graduate credit.
b. Field Study in Problems in Curriculum - 4 quarter hours of graduate credit.

c. Practicum in Psychological and Educational Research - 4 quarter hours of graduate credit.

Activities related to this core included films, reading experiences, speeches by special consultants, discussions with special resource persons, field trips, individual and small group work, discussions, and conferences with individual staff members.

The general schedule of instruction was as follows:

Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:00 to 9:00	Statistics (Methodology)	Research (Practicum)	Statistics	Statistics	Statistics
9:30 to 10:30	Curriculum (Problems)	Curriculum	Research	Curriculum	Curriculum
10:30 to 12:00	Statistics lab.	Statistics lab.	Statistics lab.	Statistics lab.	Statistics lab.
1:30 to 2:30	Research	speakers, discussions, field trips	speakers etc.	speakers etc.	Research
2:30 to 4:00	Conferences, discussions, projects	Conferences, etc.	Conferences, etc.	Conferences, etc.	Conferences, etc.

Content of the core courses is indicated by the following outlines:

a. Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research
   1. Frequency distribution, graphs, and centiles
      a. Frequency distribution
      b. Frequency poloygon - histogrom - ogive
      c. Compute centiles
   2. Averages
      a. Arithmetic mean - Averaging means
      b. Median
      c. Mode
   3. Variability
      a. Quartile deviation
      b. Average deviation
      c. Standard deviation--variance
   4. Standard scores
      a. z, T
      b. Nature of normal curve
      c. area
   5. Pearson r
      a. Nature of correlation
      b. methods of computation
      c. Interpretation

6. Linear Regression.
   a. Alpha; beta Coefficients
   b. Regression lines
   c. Standard error of estimate
7. Probability
   a. Binomial expansion
   b. Formulas of the binomial distribution
8. Sampling
   a. Definition of types
   b. Sampling distribution of the mean
   c. Standard error
   d. Estimating parameter values
9. Testing Hypothesis
   a. Type I type II error
   b. One or two tailed test
   c. Null hypotheses
   d. Standard error of difference
   e. t test
   f. F test
10. Chi Square
   a. Uses of chi square
   b. Computation
   c. Degrees of freedom
   d. Yates correction
11. Analysis of variance
   a. introduction of concepts

b. Practicum in Educational and Psychological Research
1. Brief Review of the Development of Research Methodology
2. Considerations in Problem Selection
3. Observational Approaches in Data Collection including:
   a. Questionnaires*
   b. Interviews
   c. Rating scales*
   d. Self-rating methods
   e. Critical incident techniques
   f. Sociometric techniques*
   g. Q-sort techniques
4. Traditional Experimental Design Techniques
5. Quasi-Experimental Design Techniques
6. Form and Style in Research Writing
7. Measurement in Education
   a. Summary of test development philosophies
   b. Review of measurement vocabulary
   c. The various types and classifications of tests
   d. Basic attributes of tests
   e. Class critique of selected standardized tests*
   f. The teacher-made test and construction considerations*
   g. Types of test norms
   h. Conducting local norms

i. Item analysis procedures
j. Interpreting test results

---

*Indicates areas where individual and small group projects were required. In addition, a general data gathering project was required wherein students used an instrument which they constructed to gather, analyze and interpret actual data. Considerable emphasis was placed on adapting instruments and techniques to culturally and educationally disadvantaged persons.

c. Field Study in Problems in Curriculum
   1. Curriculum Goals
   2. Influences on Curriculum Formation
   3. Curriculum Evaluation
   3. Initiating Curriculum Change
   4. Evaluation of Curriculum Changes
   5. Educational Evaluation and Curriculum
   6. Research and Curriculum Change
   (A major thread of focus was curriculum in relation to educationally and culturally disadvantaged persons.)

The staff of the institute included:
   a. Dr. Ebert Miller, Director
   b. Dr. Daryl Dell, major responsibility for statistical methods. (Substituted for Dr. Myrthalyne C. Thompson who could not teach in the institute for personal reasons.)
   c. Dr. James McElhinney, major responsibility for curriculum change and evaluation.
   d. Dr. Stanley Wenck, major responsibility for research practicum.

Special activities are outlined to demonstrate the scope of experiences provided during the institute.
   a. Films shown included the following:
      1. Portrait of the Inner City
      2. Portrait of an Inner City School
      3. Portrait of the Disadvantaged Child
      4. The 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (film strip and record).

   b. Participant structured reading activity.
   (A library of special ordered books, books from the libraries of the staff, together with bibliograph information of books available in the Ball State University Library was used to stimulate individuals and small groups to read and discuss things contributing to better understanding

of culturally disadvantaged individuals and groups, curriculum, education, research methodology and techniques, etc.)

c. The following speakers and consultants were used:
   1. Mr. Ben Ellis, IBM, Utilizing Data Processing Equipment
   2. Mr. Thomas Kinghorn, Computer Programming
   3. Mrs. Velma K. Sanders, Reading Consultant
   4. Mr. Benjamin Rice, Indiana Department of Public Instruction, Title I Evaluation Problems
   5. Dr. David Rice, Cooperative Educational Research Laboratory Incorporated
   6. Mr. Donald Mays, Counselor, Interviewing Culturally Disadvantaged Persons for Program Evaluation
   7. Mr. Alan Garringer, Teacher, Methods of Motivating Culturally Disadvantaged Children
   8. Dr. Richard McKee, Preparing Research Proposals
   9. Dr. Manfred Adler, Psychologist and Professor of Special Education, Testing Culturally Disadvantaged Persons
   10. Dr. Jack Cousins, Professor of Sociology and Education, Educational Problems of Migrant Worker Families
   11. Mr. Robert Foster, Formerly elementary principal in disadvantaged area and now district director of Office of Economic Opportunity program, initiating change in a disadvantaged area.

d. Field trips were taken to the following places:
   1. Ball State University Reading Laboratory (two sessions were conducted by the laboratory staff and then the laboratory was available each afternoon for two weeks for institute participants).
   2. Ball State University Computer Center (two trips were taken to the center-one for a general presentation and another to run sample data developed by the participants).
   3. A series of trips were taken to Muncie Community Schools Summer Program so that participants could try out interview techniques and other observational skills.

e. An individual or small group project was completed. The following excerpt from the outline shows the rationale for this experience.
   1. To provide structure for your summer's experiences, we are requesting that you complete a project appropriate to the intent of the Institute. Your project will

probably possess several of the following characteristics.

(a) The project selected should propose, justify, and evaluate learning experiences which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children "from low-income families". P.L. 89-10

(b) The project should be significant; worthy of the time and effort which you will spend and yet not so large as to be impossible.

(c) The project should propose and justify means of measuring and evaluating the impact of the learning experiences.

(d) The project should be organized and presented in a manner that clearly communicates your intentions.

(e) The project should be one which you are ready to implement due to your experiences and professional training and education.

(f) The project should be one which tentatively will yield results beneficial to you and the educationally disadvantaged pupils of your district.

(g) The project should deal with pupil experiences which you can justify including in the curriculum.

(h) The project should provide opportunities for you to apply the content of the Institute.

Evaluation of the Program

Evaluation of a program infers data about that program. The data upon which the following interpretations are based came from discussions with the participants (individually and in small groups), discussions with the staff, pre and post tests, participant evaluation questionnaire, and five semantic differential type attitude instruments.

1. Program Factors

   a. Objectives - The stated objectives of the program as well as the hopes of the staff were to improve the planning, measurement, and educational research competencies of the participants to the place that each participant was a reasonably able research and evaluation worker able to function and plan his own research and future research learning experiences. In all cases both the staff and the individual participants are convinced that improvement took place. However, in a number of cases the improvement of research competencies did not reach the point where the participant is ready to function and to plan his future research learning experiences without considerable outside help. A number of these individ-

uals expressed hope that through an intermediate level institute or through additional specialized graduate work (at Ball State University or other higher education institutions) they will be able to continue to progress. It seems logical that institutions focusing on training of public school personnel as well as the Division of Research Training and Dissemination continue to work to provide educational experiences for persons who are responsible for evaluation of public school curriculum improvement programs.

The procedural objectives of the institute (according to participant and staff evaluations) were achieved only to a relative degree, particularly as regards balance between group and individual learning experiences. As a result of the general lack of background in statistics, of past reading and/or other learning experiences related to needs of educationally and culturally disadvantaged persons, and of information about initiating and evaluating curriculum change a larger proportion of time than originally planned was spent in group learning situations. This was considered unfavorable (although unavoidable) by the staff and to a lesser degree unfavorable by some of the participants. Tighter selection of participants with an eye to assuring common past experiences and a somewhat higher beginning level of competencies in these areas seems to be called for in order to better achieve the procedural objective of favorable balance between group and individual learning experiences. Before conducting a similar program two other possibilities should be examined. One, that the curricular scope of the institute should be more limited. Two, that the procedural objective concerning balance between group and individual learning experiences be re-examined and possibly redefined.

b. Special learning activities - A summary (as reflected by the majority of the staff and/or participants) of the special activities is as follows:
   (1) Films were generally informative and valuable as introductory materials.
   (2) Participant structured reading activities were considered one of the outstanding aspects of the institute.
   (3) Special speakers and consultants were considered quite valuable. Some presentations were better than others and some were of more vital concern, but generally they would be used again in much the same way.

(4) Field trips were judged to be especially valuable and in future similar institutes should be used to a greater extent.
(5) Projects were useful but probably somewhat over-structured. More time for consultation between individual participants and staff members was indicated by both.

c. Staff - The director of the institute and the participants seem to agree that the staff was well qualified, able, and conscientious. A typical participant comment was "hard working staff, able and always available".

d. Trainees - Selection of participants was one of the major difficulties of the institute and will be discussed at greater length in part 3 of this evaluation section. One participant dropped out of the Institute because of a death in the family.

e. Organization - The timing and the length of the program seemed to be appropriate to providing as few conflicts for participants and staff as possible. One limiting aspect of getting applicants was a conflict with a summer institute and summer title one programs that potential applicants were directing and/or evaluating. Due to the late start in planning and funding Title I programs, there was a concentration on summer programs to use the funds for the fiscal year. Hopefully this conflict will not be so great in coming summers.

To be at all selective one state (i.e., Indiana) is not a large enough area from which to draw applicants.

Classroom housing was a problem because of extreme heat during the early part of the institute. Air-conditioned facilities would probably have greatly enhanced the quantity and quality of work during this period. Being able to house all the staff offices, the regular classroom activities, and laboratory activities in one location was a decided advantage (opinion of both staff and participants).

Housing for participants who bring their families to campus was a problem this year. First the research training institute program was initiated late and other institutes had first call on available housing. Second new University facilities for housing married students with families are under construction but not yet available. Third the regulation that dependency allowance would not be paid unless dependents were moved to the location of the institute caused more participants (according to the participants themselves) to bring their families along. This

not only hightened the housing shortage but also detracted (according to both participants and staff) from such participant's ability to concentrate on institute activities during the week. Even though housing for married students will be available in larger quantity in future years it is our recommendation that dependancy allowances be paid for all legitimate dependents or else no dependancy allowances at all be paid.

f. Budget - Budget estimates were more adequate than was expected at the time they were prepared. Notable exceptions are in the areas of publicizing the institute and in purchase of instructional materials. The books and other materials we wished to have on hand had to be limited because of lack of funds.

2. Program Strengths

Participants identified statistics as one of the outstanding aspects of the institute. The use of caluclators in the laboratory was unanimously described as an outstanding feature. The instruction was rated very high with the adaptability of the instructor noted in many cases. Since these were persons who, for the most part, had avoided statistics in their masters programs this endorsement constitutes very high praise.

Participants praised highly the approach to curriculum planning, change, and evaluation particularly as it related to educationally and culturally disadvantaged children. The participant structured reading and discussion procedure was highly valued.

Individual and group projects (particularly as related to the research practicum), instrument construction, and interviewing and other observational field experiences were judged to be very valuable and things to be expanded in future programs.

The "philosophy, attitudes, and ability" of the staff was rated as an outstanding aspect of the institute.

3. Major Difficulties

Probably the most valid criticism of the institute would be that we tried to do too much for the time we had. We tried to teach specific research skills (i.e., statistics, research design, and instrumentation of educational research projects for educationally and culturally disadvantaged persons) as well as to develop understandings and attitudes concerning curricular change and evaluation.

A narrowing of the scope of an eight-week institute seems to be a necessary recommendation.

Another deterant to achieving the degree of success we had hoped for was the shortage of time to communicate effectively enough with potential participants. This was unavoidable this year but the Division of Research Training and Dissemination should do everything possible to see that summer institutes, are identified and funded at a very early date (preferably no later than December of the preceding year). One result was that we had a much less than desirable range of participant abilities, past educational experiences, and direct relation to educational research.

Our application and screening procedures undoubtedly left something to be desired. These procedured should be tightened and testing procedures to as large a degree as administratively possible should be used. Materials written by the applicant were much more indicative of ability, interest, etc. than were such things as recommendations of colleagues and/or administrators. In fact, recommendations tended to be misleading not only for more poorly qualified participants but also for the better ones.

4. Overall Evaluation of the Program

Trainee evaluation forms (unsigned) indicate a high degree of satisfaction with the institute. This is true of the program in general and all aspects of the program except an exercise dealing with standardized tests. The following are examples from the participant evaluations indicative of acceptance of the program.

a. Question: As you see it now did you receive enough direction and structure in your reading and study?
   Response: Over 90% of the participants answered yes.
b. Question: What knowledge or skills that you acquired or strengthened this summer do you feel to be most important?
   Response: Curriculum change and evaluation 82% of the participants, statistics 68% of the participants, research methodology 55% of the participants.
c. Question: What knowledge or skills presented in the institute do you feel was least important to you?
   Response: Over half indicated that all seemed important and they did not wish to answer in such a way as to possibly remove one of the areas from future programs (which really doesn't help much in narrowing the scope of the program).

The most notable negative aspect of the participant evaluation concerned grading. The "most significant irritant" listed by 27% of the participants was grading. Many felt that giving grades interferred with learning. The staff attempted to minimize this factor but apparently was not altogether successful.

A 50 question test over research methodology and design and a 43 question test over statistical concepts was administered as a pretest and then readministered as a posttest. The following tabular material summarizes the results. Interpretation of this one-group pretest-posttest pre-experiments design will be left to the reader.

Research Methodology and Design Test

Pretest	Posttest
mean = 31.35	mean = 40.69
standard deviation = 4.41	standard deviation = 2.50
t = 9.25	$<.001$
25 df	

Statistical Methods

Pretest	Posttest
mean = 22.05	mean = 30.91
standard deviation = 3.94	standard deviation = 4.08
t = 7.15	$<.001$
21 df	

5. USOE Administration of the Educational Research Training Program.

The relations with the Research Training Branch of the Division of Research Training and Dissemination have been exceptionally fine. The following suggestions are made not as criticisms but in terms of facilitating implementation of research training programs at our level.

a. A need for earlier processing and notification regarding summer institutes (see section on Major Difficulties).
b. A need for a change in policy concerning payment of dependancy allowances (see section on Organization).

Program Reports

1. Publicity - Because of a sizeable time gap between receiving approval of our proposal by the Division of Research Training and Dissemination and the working out of the contract with the Contracts Office news paper publicity was delayed (by governmental stipulation) until nearly the beginning of the institute. Brochures (see apendix A) and application forms were mailed to all school corporations in Indiana and Illinois. Talks were made and brochures were handed out at three Indiana School Study Council meetings as well as at meetings conducted by the State Department of Public Instruction for school administrators and directors of schools with Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs.

   The first mailings were sent out near May 1, 1966. Over 1500 brochures were distributed by mail and other means.

2. Application Summary

   a. Approximate number of inquiries from prospective trainees (letter or conversation). 60

   b. Number of completed applications received. 33

   c. Number of first rank applications (Applicants who are well-qualified whether or not they were offered admission). 31

   d. How many applicants were offered admission? 31

3. Trainee Summary

   a. Number of trainees initially acepted in program. 30
      Number of trainees enrolled at the beginning of program. 27
      Number of trainees who completed program. 26

   b. Categorization of trainees
      (1) Number of trainees who principally are elementary or secondary public school teachers 8
      (2) Number of trainees who are principally local public school administrators or supervisors 16
      (3) Number of trainees from State education groups 2
      (4) Number of trainees from colleges or universities, junior colleges, research bureaus, etc. (specify) any of the above 0

4. Program Director's Attendance

a. What was the number of instructional days for the program? 39

b. What was the percent of days the director was present? 97.4

5. Financial Summary--(Note: This summary does not serve as a final financial report so amounts need not be exact.)

	Budgeted	Expended or Committed
a. Trainee Support		
(1) Stipends	$18,000.	$16,050.
(2) Dependency allowance	9,000.	3,030.
(3) Travel	480.	482.
b. Direct Costs		
(1) Personnel	17,336.	16,984.
(2) Supplies	1,200.	849.
(3) Equipment	1,000.	1,000.
(4) Travel	296.	10.
(5) Other	1,746.	1,346.
c. Indirect Costs	3,925.	3,925.
TOTAL	52,983.	43,676.

Appendix A

Educational Research Training Program

1966 Summer Institute

June 20—August 12

Research and Evaluation Techniques

Preparing Designated Public School Personnel to Evaluate Present and Future Title I Projects

to be conducted by

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY
Muncie, Indiana

Under contract with
The United States Office of Education

as authorized by
P. L. 83-51, Section 2(b), as
amended by P. L. 89-10, Title IV

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY
Muncie, Indiana

Educational Research
Training Program Institute

Research and Evaluation Techniques

Preparing Designated Public School Personnel to Evaluate Present and Future Title I Projects

June 20—August 12, 1966 (Eight weeks)

PROGRAM

Ball State University announces an eight-week institute for 30 public school professional teachers, supervisors, or administrators with the designated responsibility for the direction of the planning and evaluation of Title I projects in their individual schools.

A "core curriculum" will focus on preparing the participants to plan more effectively and to evaluate the present and future Title I programs in their respective schools. Special courses in methodology of educational research, problems in curriculum development, and practicum in educational and psychological research will comprise the "core curriculum."

In order to help achieve the curriculum objectives and at the same time maximize the chances of such knowledge and skills becoming functional, group learning situations will be planned with supervised laboratory work and individual help. Title I programs (present and/or future) will serve as a vehicle for learning and application of research and evaluation techniques.

Activities of the institute will include lectures by visiting resource persons and field trips to Title I summer projects.

OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of the proposed training program is to improve the planning, measurement, and educational research competencies of thirty public school persons to direct the planning and evaluation of Title I (The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965-P. L. 89-10) programs in their respective schools.

More explicitly, the curriculum objectives are to prepare the participants to:

1. read, interpret, and appreciate research findings in behavioral sciences which have implications for educational practice.
2. plan and evaluate educational programs in relation to the special needs of "educationally deprived children in low-income areas."
3. make use of special data handling resources.
4. conduct educational research and evaluation projects within a public school setting.

CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION

Participants shall be selected on the basis of their ability to benefit from the program of the institute (as indicated by evidence submitted in the formal application) without regard to sex, race, creed, color, or national origin. Applicants may be from any part of Indiana. Application forms must be completed which will present evidence concerning the following requirements:

1. Candidate must have a statement from the chief administrative officer of his or her school stating that the participant has been designated as the person (or one of the persons) responsible for the direction and evaluation of the Title I program(s) for that school. A brief narrative summary of the present and/or proposed Title I program(s) will be required.
2. Candidate must have a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution substantiated by an official and complete transcript.
3. Candidate must have successfully completed a basic course in statistical methodology.
4. Candidate must (a) complete a statement reviewing his/her training and experience relating to curriculum planning and (b) complete a statement of present and future interest in and commitment to educational research activities.

es of the institute will include lectures g resource persons and field trips to mer projects.

VES

ry objective of the proposed training pro- improve the planning, measurement, and l research competencies of thirty public sons to direct the planning and evalua- le I (The Elementary and Secondary Edu- of 1965-P. L. 89-10) programs in their schools.

explicitly, the curriculum objectives are the participants to:

, interpret, and appreciate research find- in behavioral sciences which have im- ations for educational practice.

n and evaluate educational programs in tion to the special needs of "education- deprived children in low-income areas."

e use of special data handling resources.

duct educational research and evaluation jects within a public school setting.

IA FOR ADMISSION

nts shall be selected on the basis of their benefit from the program of the institute ated by evidence submitted in the formal on) without regard to sex, race, creed, national origin. Applicants may be from of Indiana. Application forms must be d which will present evidence concerning wing requirements:

ndidate must have a statement from the ief administrative officer of his or her hool stating that the participant has been signated as the person (or one of the per- ns) responsible for the direction and eval- tion of the Title I program(s) for that hool. A brief narrative summary of the esent and/or proposed Title I program(s) ll be required.

ndidate must have a bachelor's degree m an accredited institution substantiated an official and complete transcript.

ndidate must have successfully completed basic course in statistical methodology.

ndidate must (a) complete a statement viewing his/her training and experience lating to curriculum planning and (b) com- ete a statement of present and future in- rest in and commitment to educational search activities.

5. Candidate must have the recommendation of a current administrative superior and a colleague from the staff (both from the applicant's school system).

STIPENDS

Each institute enrollee is eligible to receive a stipend of $75 per week. An allowance of $15 per week may be claimed for a dependent of a trainee enrolled in a short-term Institute or Special Training Project only if the trainee establishes a special temporary residence specifically for the purpose of attending the Institute or Special Training Project and then only if the dependent accompanies and resides with him during the training period.

TUITION AND FEES

Tuition and fees (except for vehicle registration fee) are paid for participants through the contract with the United States Office of Education under Title IV of P. L. 89-10.

Participants must purchase their own books and materials and are responsible for their transportation from their homes to and from Muncie.

ACADEMIC CREDIT

Institute courses carry graduate credit only. A maximum amount of eleven quarter hours of credit may be earned by each participant during the eight-week period.

Each participant, whether or not interested in obtaining academic credit, will be expected to devote full time to the work of the institute. Participants will be involved in class (or directed activities) from 8:00 a.m. until at least 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.

HOUSING AND MEALS

Provision has been made for housing participants in one of the University residence halls. Room for the eight-week period will cost $76.80 per person in a double room and $112 per person in a single room. Meals are purchased separately in the residence hall cafeteria; thus, the cost will vary with the individual.

The informal exchange of ideas which is fostered by participants living and eating together is considered a valuable part of the institute program. Commuting or living off campus will be discouraged.

STAFF

Director: Ebert L. Miller, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Ball State University

Instructor: James H. McElhinney, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Education
Ball State University

Instructor: Stanley L. Wenck, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor of Education
and Psychology
Ball State University

Instructor: To be named.

HOW TO APPLY

Address requests for application forms to:
Dr. Ebert L. Miller, Director
Educational Research Training Institute
North Hall 121
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana 47306

Deadline for filing applications: May 16, 1966

Successful applicants and alternates will be notified by May 21, 1966.